Sept.

(31)

REMARKS

Upon a Late

PAMPHLET,

ENTITULED,

A Brief and Full Account

OF

Mr. *Tate*'s and Mr. *Brady*'s

NEW VERSION

OF THE

PSALMS.

By a Divine of the Church of England.

LONDON,

Printed for *William Keblewhite* at the *Swan* in St. *Paul*'s Church-yard. 1699.

BODLEIAN LIBRARY

Remarks

UPON THE

VINDICATION

OF THE

New Version

OF THE

PSALMS.

THE *Vindicator* of the *new Version* of the *Psalms* in *Metre*, by Mr. *Brady* and Mr. *Tate*, presuming in such an insolent manner to impose the Use of it upon the *Clergy* and *People* throughout the whole *Kingdom*, and so saucily to reflect on those who will not comply with the *proud, imposing Humour*, and pay an immediate voluntary Obedience to it; I beg

leave to animadvert a little upon ſome Inſtances of his unaccountable Boldneſs, and ſupercilious Arrogance, in theſe following *Remarks.*

And, firſt of all, I cannot but obſerve, That it is inconſiſtent with good Manners, and the Deference which we owe to Antiquity, and the *Authors* of the *old Verſion* of the *Pſalms* in *Metre*, which has been univerſally receiv'd and us'd throughout this Kingdom ſince the *Reformation*, and which, by the *Vindicator*'s own Confeſſion, has adminiſtred ſingular Inſtruction, and Conſolation, and unſpeakable Benefit to thoſe who have piouſly and devoutly us'd it, to caſt ſuch an awkard and diſingenuous Reflection on the Authors of it, who have been the happy Inſtruments of celebrating the Praiſes of our *Creator* and *Redeemer* in the Houſe of Prayer, of bringing ſo much Glory to God, and doing ſo much good in the World.

And though the *old Verſion* of the *Pſalms* in *Metre* was compos'd by its *Authors* in a plain and humble Style, ſutable to the Age they liv'd in, wherein there are ſome obſolete and uncouth Expreſſions, which have a harſh and jarring Sound in the delicate and muſical Ears of the ingenious, and unſutable to the Modes of Speaking in this refined, this politer Age; yet 'tis very undecent to ridicule and expoſe it, and as unpardonable a Rudeneſs, as for a converted *Jew* to ſcoff at the

the Stammering of *Moſes*, or ridicule the old Service of the *Sanctuary*, becauſe we have now a more Spiritual Worſhip, ſutable to Goſpel-times, a better and more perfect *Tabernacle*.

The Apoſtle of the *Gentiles*, by his own Example, taught his new Proſelytes to pay Reſpect and Reverence to Circumciſion, and the Rites of the aboliſh'd Law, though dead with *Chriſt*, and nailed to his Croſs, and to give it an honourable and a decent Burial. And the like Reſpect is due to the *old Verſion*, when aboliſh'd by *Convocation*, and ſilenc'd in a lawful Aſſembly.

But for this bold Impoſer to attempt to recommend his *new Verſion* by railing at the *old one*, and the *Authors* of it, and impoſe the Reception and Uſe of his new Compoſure upon the *Clergy* and *People*, before it has received the Stamp of Lawful Authority, that of a *Convocation* I mean, who, as the proper Judges in Sacred Things, are to inſpect, conſider of, and recommend all the Branches of publick Worſhip that is fixed and ſettled, of conſtant and perpetual Uſe, (which when confirm'd by the *Royal Allowance* and Injunction, is then, and not before, to be impos'd and generally us'd with a *Nemine Contradicente*, both by the

As for occaſional Services upon extraordinary Days, whether Faſts or Feſtivals, it has been cuſtomary for the King to appoint ſome of the Biſhops to compoſe them.

Clergy and *People*) is unaccountable Insolence, and unpardonable Presumption.

But to enter into the Merits of the Cause, and to do the *Vindicator* Justice, let us examin the Validity of his Arguments, by which he labours to promote a general Reception of his new Translation, and evince it to be the Duty both of the *Clergy* and *People*, especially the former, to receive and use it in all Churches and Chappels throughout the Kingdom: Which I am apt to think, upon a strict Enquiry, and close Examination, will appear to the impartial Reader to be very vain and trifling, illogical and inconclusive.

There are Three Arguments which he advances, and chiefly insists upon to this purpose; *viz. The Agreeableness of this Design with Reason; the Conformity of it with the Constitutions of our Church, and the Authority of Convocation; and its Subserviency to the Advancement and Increase of Piety.*

1. He insists on *the Agreeableness of this Design with Reason. And both this,* he tell us, *and the other Arguments,* which he has chosen to insist upon, *are plainly intimated in the Letter of the Bishops, which,* he says, *is this.*

P. 13. *His Majesty having allowed and permitted the Use of a new Version of the Psalms of* David, *by Mr.* Brady *and Mr.* Tate, *in all Churches,*

Churches, Chappels, and Congregations; I cannot do less than wish a good success to this Royal Indulgence— And I do heartily recommend the Use of this Version to all my Brethren within my Diocess.

So that here the *Vindicator* argues from Two Things; *viz.* the *Royal Allowance*, and the *Bishop's Recommendation.*

1. He argues from the *Royal Allowance*, which he would make tantamount to an *Injunction*, at least a *Recommendation*; whereas it is neither the one, nor the other.

1. Not an *Injunction*, neither expressly, nor by implication. The *Royal Allowance*, in this Instance, is of the same Force and Validity with an *Imprimatur* prefixt to a Book or Sermon, which barely permits the Printing and Publishing of it, the Licenser being satisfied that nothing is contained in it contrary to the Government, the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, and good Manners; but does not ingage any one to buy or read it. The *Royal Stamp* upon the Title-page of a Sermon preached at *Court*, —*Published by his Majesty's special Command* — carries with it no more than the Force of a Licence, though of a Superior Nature, for the Printing and Publishing of it; but does not injoin all the Subjects of *England*, *Clergy* and *People*, to pay an

universal Respect to it, or to receive and use it as they do the Book of *Homilies*, the *Common Prayer*, and the *Bible*. They that are dispos'd to buy, and read, and use such a Sermon, that is honoured with the *Royal Licence* or *Allowance*, may, if they please, if not they may refuse so to do; and, I hope, there is no Disobedience in the Refusal. And so much, with submission, I think is intimated in the *Terms* of the *Royal Allowance* prefixt to the new New Version of the *Psalms*, which the *Vindicator* recites; *viz.*

P. 7. — *His Majesty taking the same into his Royal Consideration, is pleased to order in Council, That the said new Version of the* Psalms *in English Metre be, and the same is hereby Allowed and Permitted to be used, in all Churches, Chappels, and Congregations, as shall think fit to receive the same.*

So that they that think fit to receive and use it, may; and they that do not, may let it alone, and consequently may use the *old Version* if they please: Which, by the *Vindicator's* Leave, is not forbid to be used by the *Royal Allowance*, though very illogically he concludes it is, p. 22, & 27. of his *Vindication*.

Where then, *Good Mr. Vindicator*, is the *Royal Injunction*, or any Thing like it? And consequently, where is the *Disobedience* upon a Non-compliance, which you so magisterially and insultingly Charge the *Clergy* and

People

People with, who refuſe to receive and uſe the *new Verſion*?

And indeed I cannot but wonder, That the *Vindicator*, and his *Authors*, (who perhaps are the ſame) ſhould expect more than they themſelves deſired. For it may be obſerv'd, That the *Royal Order* and *Allowance*, in that Inſtance of Indifferency before mention'd, is conform to the Prayer of the Petition; P. 7. ——— *And humbly praying his Majeſty's Royal Allowance, That the ſaid Verſion may be uſed in ſuch Congregations as ſhall think fit to receive it.* And perhaps the Petitioners could obtain no more, the *King* probably not thinking it practicable to make his *Order* abſolute, and injoyn the Reception and Uſe of the *new Verſion*, until it had received the Cenſure and Approbation of a *Convocation*.

In the Interim, the Petitioners having paid the Secretary's Fees for the *Order*, the *new Verſion* with the *Royal Allowance* was to take its Fate; and 'twas rude and unreaſonable for the *Vindicator*, and his *Authors*, to rail, and ſtorm, and grow angry, and ſcatter their Invectives, becauſe it was no more ſucceſsful, and did not meet with an univerſal Reception, and conſequently anſwer the Expence, perhaps of a *Luſty Sum*, for obtaining the *Royal Inſtrument*, and the *Impreſſion*.

Add to this, in the next Place, That there is not one Word in the *Royal Allowance* that amounts to a *Recommendation*, or looks like it; but

but rather the contrary may be inferr'd from the *Coldneſs* and *Indifferency* which are legible in the *Terms* of the *Royal Allowance*. And yet the *Vindicator* has the Confidence to affirm, That the *new Verſion* has not only the *Allowance*, but the *Recommendation* of *Authority*. P. 3.

Well, but though the *King* neither injoyns nor *recommends*, yet perhaps the *Biſhops* do; from whence the *Vindicator* would infer, That 'tis the Duty both of the *Clergy* and *People*, to pay an univerſal Compliance and Obedience.

And this is the next Topick from which he argues; *viz.* The *Biſhop's Recommendation*.

Againſt the Validity of which, as it is recited by the *Vindicator* to evince what he contends for, I have theſe Exceptions.

1. It does not appear that either the *Biſhop* of *London*, or any other *Biſhop*, is the Author of it, there being no Name ſubſcrib'd, as there is to the *Royal Allowance*, and is uſual in ſuch Caſes. It may be a *Recommendation* from *Tom Thumb*, or *John a Styles*, for any Thing that appears to the contrary.

2. The *King's Allowance* being the Foundation upon which the *Recommendation* is pretended to be built, It cannot be ſuppos'd, That either the *Biſhop* of *London*, or any other *Biſhop*, would be guilty of ſo great a *Prevarication*,

cution, as to misrepresent, falsely report, and partially and imperfectly recite the *Royall Allowance*, on which they found their *Recommendation*.

Now that the *Royal Allowance* is misrepresent, falsely reported, and partially and imperfectly recited in the aforesaid *Recommendation* is evident. The Words are these,

P. 13. *His Majesty having allowed and permitted the use of a new Version of the Psalms of* David, *by Mr.* Brady *and Mr.* Tate, *in all Churches, Chappels and Congregations*———.

So runs the Preamble of the *Recommendation*; so far it goes and no farther, omitting what follows in the *Royal Allowance*, viz. ——*As shall think fit to receive the same*. Which is a Limitation and Restriction, and a Signification, That the *King* did not intend to impose or injoin the reception and use of this *new Version* upon any, but intirely left it to the discretion and pleasure of the *Clergy* and *People*, whether they would receive it, and use it or no; but the *Recommendation* by that Misreprentation and false recital of the *Royal Allowance* looks *Trickish* and *Designing*, as if the intent of it was to insinuate, That the *Royal Order* was *positive* and *absolute*, and did tantamount to an *Injunction* for the universal Reception and use of this *new Version*.

But

But 3*dly*, Suppoſing, tho' not granting, that this *Recommendation* was really, and *bona fide* the Biſhops, and Subſcribed by one or more of them; in which 'tis poſſible, That through haſte, an hurry of Buſineſs, or the preſſing of their more weighty Affairs, they may be impos'd upon, and prevail'd with to Subſcribe a Paper purporting a *Recommendation*, drawn up ready to their Hands, either by the *Vindicator* or his *Authors*, without critically examining the *Royal Allowance*; yet the *King*'s Order and Allowance, which is the *Poſtulatum*, the *Baſis*, the *Foundation* on which the *Recommendation* is founded, being miſrepreſented, and falſely and imperfectly recited, the *Recommendation* is invalid, and ſignifies juſt nothing: For a *falſe Recital* is no *Recital* at all, and conſequently all the *Arguments*, *Inferences* and *Concluſions*, which the *Vindicator* builds upon, or deduces from it, fall to the Ground, and are meer impertinence. And ſo much for his Firſt general Argument; which is drawn from the *Agreeableneſs of this Deſign with Reaſon.*

Let us now examine the *Second*, and ſee whether any better Fate will attend it.

2. His *Second Argument* to evince what he contends for, he deduces from the *Conformity of it to the Conſtitution of our Church, and the Authority of Convocations. And ſo*, ſays he,

he, p. 21. *it plainly appears in as much as it* (i.e. the new Version) *is allow'd of by the King, and recommended by the Bishops.* And for this he quotes the *Rubrick* before the Sentences at the *Offertory*. ——— **And nothing shall be proclaimed or published in the Church during the time of Divine Service, but by the Minister: Nor by him any thing but what is prescribed in the Rules of this Book, or injoined by the King, or by the Ordinary of the place.** Thus far the *Rubrick*. Then follows the *Vindicator*'s Comment, Observations, Arguments and Conclusions from it. *Where, by the way,* says he, *thus much we may Observe, That no Clerk of a Parish can Sing in the Church but as he is directed by his Minister, and as he acts as his Deputy.*

Very well Argued Mr. *Vindicator!* a very natural Inference and logical Conclusion from the Premisses!—**Nothing shall be proclaimed or published in the Church, during the time of Divine Service, but by the Minister.** Ergo, *No Parish Clerk can Sing in the Church but as he is directed by his Minister, and as he acts as his Deputy.* Whereas the Inference lay quite on the other side; and it would have been more naturally Inferr'd, and logically Concluded from the Premisses as he quotes and applies them. Therefore no Parish Clerk can Sing in the Church at all; because nothing is to be proclaim'd or published

in

in the Church during the time of Divine Service, but by the Minister.

And here by the way, I must observe Two Things.

1. What a horrid Blunder the *Vindicator* is guilty of, in calling the *Parish Clerk the Ministers Deputy*.

2. That he misapplies the *Rubrick*.

1. The *Vindicator* is guilty of a horrid Blunder, in calling the *Parish Clerk* the *Ministers Deputy*. A *Deputy* is one who is to execute the Office of his *Chief*, and to do the same thing which the principal Person is to do, to whom he is a *Deputy*. So that if the *Parish Clerk* is *the Ministers Deputy*, he may *read Prayers, Preach, and administer the Sacraments, and Marry, and Bury the Dead*; as a certain *Parish Clerk* in a Country Town did, who fancied himself to be the *Ministers Deputy*, his Master being Sick, and actually read the Burial Service from time to time at the Graves of the Deceased; until he was severely reprimanded by the Bishop himself, and threatned to be turned out of his Place if ever he presumed to do so any more.

Nor can the *Vindicator* excuse himself by saying, That the *Parish Clerk* is the *Ministers Deputy* only in *Singing*. For *Singing*, i. e. to Tune

Tune Psalms, and lead the Congregation in singing, is not, strictly speaking, the Office of the *Minister*. The *Parish Clerk* is to Name and Tune the Psalm, and to Dictate or Read the Verses and Lines of it. He is to be the *Præcentor* in a Parochial Congregation; as is intimated in the 91 *Canon*, where it is decreed amongst other Qualifications of a *Parish Clerk*, That he shall be skill'd *legendi & cantandi scientiâ*, in Reading and Singing.

But *2ly*. The *Vindicator* is guilty of a very great Mistake, in misapplying the *Rubrick*. The *Rubrick* which he quotes, which is before the Sentences at the *Offertory*, does not concern any part of *Divine Service*, or *Singing of Psalms*, or the *Sermon*, but the publishing of of Occcsianal Things; as the giving Notice of Holy Days, the Celebration of the Communion, publishing the Banns of Matrimony, Briefs, Proclamations, Declarations, Citations and Excommunications, as appears by the Words of the *Rubrick*, which immediately follow the *Nicene* Creed, which are these.

Then the Curate shall declare unto the People what Holy-days, or Fasting-days are in the Week following to be observed, and then also (if occasion be) shall notice be given of the Communion; and the Banns of Matrimony published, and

Briefs,

Briefs, Citations and Excommunications read. It follows. ——And nothing shall be proclaimed or published in the Church, during the time of Divine Service, but by the Minister: Nor by him any thing, but what is prescribed in the Rules of this Book, or enjoined by the King, or by the Ordinary of the place. Which last Words the *Vindicator* quotes, omitting the former Words of this *Rubrick*, because I presume they made against him.

Besides the natural import of the Words of the *Rubrick* which the *Vindicator* quotes, sufficiently shews that it does not, cannot concern any part of the solemn Worship, either reading Divine Service or singing of the Psalms. 'Tis an incongruity of Speech to call either the one or the other *Proclaiming* or *Publishing*. And that which he lays the greatest stress upon, is nothing to his purpose, *viz.* those Words of the *Rubrick* which he quotes. ——Nor by him any thing, but what is prescribed in the Rules of this Book, or enjoined by the King, or by the Ordinary of the place. Which does plainly respect what is Prohibited by the 72 *Canon*, viz. That no *Minister* shall presume to appoint *publick* or *private Fasts*, *Exercises*, *Lectures*, *Prophecies*, *Exorcisms*, &c. without a lawful Command or

Vide 72 Can. cui Tit. Ministri publica Jejun. Prophetias, &c. privato usu celebrare prohibiti.

Licence from his Superiors. And 'tis obvious what great Miſchiefs would be conſequent on ſuch an unbounded Liberty. So that it is plain, That this *Rubrick* is far from countenancing, or giving any ſtrength or force to his *Argument*, to prove what he contends for, drawn from the *Conformity* of it to the *Conſtitution* of our *Church*, and the *Authority* of *Convocation*. And this *Gentleman's* arguing from it to prove the Practicableneſs and neceſſity of introducing of his *new Verſion* into *Churches*, and that 'tis the Duty of all the *Clergy* eſpecially, to comply with it, and receive and uſe it, upon the ſcore of Obedience which they owe to the *Governours* both in *Church* and *State*, becauſe of the *King's Allowance*, and the *Biſhops* ſuppos'd *Recommendation* of it, is either out of *Ignorance* or *Deſign*. If the *former*, behold the *Learned Vindicator*! If the *latter*, I'll leave it to the Reader to give him a *Name*. 'Tis true, the *Rubrick* before mentioned was confirmed by *Convocation*, and Act of *Parliament*; but does it therefore follow, That Mr. *Brady's* and Mr. *Tate's new Verſion* of the Pſalms in *Metre*, becauſe allowed by the *King* and recommended by ſome of the *Biſhops*, is confirmed by the ſame *Authority*? I leave it to any Man of Senſe to judge and determine.

So that his *Foundation* failing, all that he ſuperſtructs upon it muſt totter and fall. How unjuſt, falſe and trifling; How Illogical and Inconcluſive are all his *Arguments*,

Inferences and *Conclusions*, which he builds upon, or deduces from it; And how bold and rude, and unaccountable, are his base *Reflections*, which without any Modesty or Respect or deference to their Character he casts upon the *reverend Clergy* of this fam'd *Metropolis*, as well as the rest of the vast Body of the *Clergy* of the Two *Provinces*; who, generally speaking, refuse to receive and use this *new Version*; who indeed are very much oblig'd to the *modest Vindicator*, for that *honourable Character* which he is pleas'd to bestow upon them, representing them as *Stubborn, contumacious Violators of the Oath of Canonical Obedience, and their solemn Ingagement* at their *Ordination*; *Opposers of the Authority of Convocations and Parliaments, and Enemies to their Rights and Privileges; Despisers of Government, and disobedient to Governours both in Church and State*; *Proud, Disdainful, Self-conceited, Envious, Malicious*, what not *&c.*

I refer the *Reader* to his Book, and only beg leave to select a few Passages, which are Instances of his great *Complement* and *Respect* to the *Clergy*, who are non Compliers, and refuse to receive and use this *new Version*. In the 23 p. are these Words,

——*And he seems to vacate both their Authorities*, i.e. of Convocation and Parliament, *who opposes that encouragement which it has already received from his Majesty and the Bishops, and en-*

dea-

deavours to enervate all their Efficacy and Strength by rendring them useless and insignificant. And a little after, in the same Page. —— *Whoever therefore it is that contradicts this Authority which they have freely consented should be vested in the King, and the Bishops seems directly to oppose the Power of that sacred Body, and to be a direct Enemy to the Rights and Privileges of a Convocation.* And again, p. 25. *Whoever therefore it is that opposes that Authority which the New Translation has obtained, seems plainly to deprive the Convocation of those signal Honours and Immunities appertaining to them, which the Parliament has been pleas'd to confirm, and the King and the Bishops are pleas'd to act by, who have the executive Power,* &c. And again, p. 27, 28. —— *Therefore if any one reject this New Translation of the Psalms, recommended to him by his Bishop, I cannot see how he will avoid the Censure of casting a Scandalous Reproach upon the goldly Judgment of his Ordinary, and palpably violating that religious Obligation which he solemnly entered into at the time of his Ordination before the Bishop, the Priests, and the Congregation. But I fancy the Persons will be but few, who will be so hardy against their own Consciences, and cancel all the veneration which is due both to their Diocesan and themselves, if they hope that God should be their Helper.* And again, p. 28, 29. ——— *It cannot be inveterately opposed by any, unless it be by some few Persons who may envy the Production, because it is not their own, or because it has met with such good*

Success, or those that are prejudic'd against the Royal Allowance, because William R. *is on the front of it, or such as look upon the Recommendatory Letter of a Diocesan as only a meer Matter of Form; or lastly, those who are such zealous Admirers of Antiquity, that they will object against any thing, barely for its being New.*

These are some of the Instances of his *Complement* and *Respect* to the *Clergy*, at whom the Reflection is directly aim'd, though obliquely, and by consequence at the *People* too, who are not reconcil'd to the use of the new Psalms, as I hear very few in this City are. All which consider'd, I leave it to the Reader to judge how justly the *Vindicator*'s Book deserves the Title of *A modest Vindication of the new Version of the Psalms.*

A Word or Two of his 3*d Argument* and I have done. And this is drawn from *the Subserviency of the new Psalms to the Advancement of Piety and Devotion.*

But how does it appear that they are more *Subservient* to this end than the old *Version?* What, is it because of the venerable Names of Mr. *Brady* and Mr. *Tate*, the *celebrated Authors* of the *new Performance?* who seem to be very *unluckily coupled* in this Enterprize, *a Divine* and *a Player*, a *Christian Priest* and a *Stage Poet*, as unequally yokt as the Ox and the *Ass*, which were forbid by the Law of *Moses* to draw together in the same Yoke. But perhaps none

was so fit for the Undertaking, to give it Reputation, especially amongst *Pretenders to Wit*, as a *Comic-Divine* and a *Poet Laureat*.

But perhaps Mr. *Sternold* and Mr. *Hopkins* (the *Vindicator*, I hope, will not be offended that I give them the usual Complement of Respect, though he denies it them, having I find no *M* under his Girdle) perhaps, I say, Mr. *Sternold* and Mr. *Hopkins*, the *Authors* of the *old Version*, were Men as famous in their Generation for *Learning* and *Piety*, as the *Authors* of this *new Translation* can pretend to be. And if I am not mis-inform'd, they were so, if not by many Degrees beyond them.

Let their *Work* praise 'em in the Gate: The Thing speaks it self: The *Performance* discovers them to be acted by *a Divine Spirit*, and breaths a Celestial Sweetness like the droppings of *Myrrhe*, and the Perfumes of *Aloes* and *Cassia*, the fragrant Odours of the Sanctuary, of which the *Garments* of the Spiritual *Bridegroom* smell.

Such an *Air* of *Piety* and *Devotion*, *Rapture* and *Extacy*, *Spiritual Life and Vigour*, *holy Flames* and *heavenly Transports* appears through the whole Performance, (making allowances for some obsolete and uncouth Expressions) that it speaks the *Authors* to be no contemptible Men, that they studied not only the Psalmists Words, but his Mind and Practice too, and were Transform'd into a sort of likeness to the *Roy-*

al Author, and were perfect *Masters* of *Divine Musick*.

They had truly learnt to tune *David's Harp* with agreeable *Notes* and *Accents*, suitable to the Nature of that *Divine Poem*; and that in all the Instances of *humble Penitence* and *holy Vows*, *godly Sorrow* and *transporting Joy*, *devout Supplications*, and *heavenly Praises* and *Hallelujahs*. They bent their Minds to the Study of a *Divine Poem*, which was compos'd with an *Air* suitable to *Spiritual Psalmody*, and the *Divine Subject*, and was not polluted with the *wanton Strains* of *prophane Poetry*; they did not mingle the *unhallowed Fires* of the *Stage*, with the *holy Sparks* of the *Altar*.

Moreover, the *Performance* favours of *Charity* to the Unskilful in the *Airs* of the *Original Text*, or the *Translation* in *Prose*, which is sung in *Cathedrals* with suitable *Notes* and ravishing *Accents*, bearing some Resemblance to the *Hallelujahs* above; which the *Vulgar* may stare at, and admire, but cannot join, or bear a part in that kind of *Psalmody*. So that *Thousands*, and *Ten thousands*, since the *Reformation*, had been depriv'd of the Benefit, and Pleasure, and Solace, and Comfort of singing the Praises of God in the *Psalms* of *David*, the *sweet Singer of Israel*, had not those *charitable Authors* condescended to their Capacities, by composing a *plain and familiar Metre*.

So

So that 'twill be a hard Task for the *Vindicator* to prove, That the *new* are more subservient to the *Advancement of Piety and Devotion* than the *old Psalms*, and that upon account of the *genuine Excellence and Composure of the new Version*, *which*, he says, *by many Degrees surpasses the old*.

But it is objected, The *old Psalms* are written in a plain and familiar Style.

So much the better, being suitable to *Scripture-Language*, which for the most part, excepting some Philosophical Discourses in *Job*, and the Lofty Flights of the Prophet *Isaiah*, and the Ænigmatical Passages in *Daniel* and the *Revelation*, is delivered in a plain and familiar Style; the *Spirit* of *God* delighting to express it self in plain and intelligible Words, condescending to the meanest Capacity; and withal most agreeable to the *holy Text*, most of the *Psalms* being *Prayers*, which are wont to be deliver'd in plain and familiar Terms, (though there are not wanting Rhetorical Flourishes in *Eucharistical Psalms*) and more suitable to the Capacities of *Parochial Congregations*, where plain and unlearned *Auditors* are the most numerous.

But by the *Vindicator*'s Favour, there are some suitable Strokes to *Psalms* of *Triumph*; some *lofty Strains*, as well as *humble Notes*; not only the *Mournings* of the *Dove*, but the *Soarings* of the *Eagle*; not only *Shallows*

wherein a *Lamb may wade*, but *Depths* wherein an *Elephant may swim*.

But in the *old Version* there are many *obsolete* and *uncouth Expressions*, which offend the Ears of the Ingenious, *Who*, it seems, p. 36. *are well-disposed to the Liturgy of our Church, yet frequently absent themselves from it*, (a very good Evidence indeed of their Respect and Affection to it!) *and that in Honour to Almighty God; because it is rather a Contempt*, they say, *than a Respect, to pay their Homage directly contrary to what his holy Word prescribes*, both in Psal. 47. 7. *Sing ye Praises with Understanding*. *And* 1 Cor. 14. 15. *I will sing with the Spirit, and I will sing with the Understanding also*.

By the way, let me ask the *Vindicator*, Whether the *Unlearned* (who are the more numerous) may not make the same Objection against hard, and to them unintelligible, Words in our politer Modes of Speaking, that the Learned and Ingenious do against those *obsolete* and *uncouth Expressions* which are in the *old Translation*.

But admit it, That there are many *obsolete* and *uncouth* Expressions in the *old Translation*; yet there are *Psalms* enough that may be selected for publick and private Use that are *unexceptionable*, and perhaps by many Degrees, and in divers Instances, *preferable* to the *new Composure*. But I think this Objection is, or may be, silenc'd by the Care that has been taken in the late *Editions* of the *Psalms*

to

to expunge those *obsolete* and *uncouth* Expressions, so much complain'd of, and exchange them for others that are more agreeable to the modern *Phraseology*, and the present Modes of Speaking and Writing. There is a Difference between repairing a House, and pulling it down; between amending the Defects, and destroying the Fabrick. There are perhaps some Passages in the *English Translation* of the *Old* and *New Testament*, which might be better render'd. What then? Must we destroy the *old Frame*, and have a *new Bible*?

But the *old Version* had never the Approbation of a *Convocation*.

What then? Though perhaps it never past the Censure of a *Convocation*, or had a *formal Approbation*, yet it had a *virtual one*; the *old Psalms* being received and us'd, not only in *vulgar Auditories* and *Parochial Congregations*, but in *learned Assemblies*; as the *Two Universities*, the Nurseries of Learning, from whence proceed the Members of that Learned and Sacred Body of a *Convocation*; the Convention of the *Clergy*, at the *Episcopal* and *Archi-diaconal Visitations*, which are wont to be held in Parochial Churches; yea, even in the Assembly of the *Convocation-men*, at their Solemn Meeting, when a Psalm is sung before the Sermon; which speaks at least their tacit Approbation. And the Silence of *Convocations*, which the *Vindicator* makes an Argument against, I think an Argument for the

Appro-

Approbation of the *old Psalms*, and the Use and Continuance of them; in regard our *Convocations*, who are the *Church Representative*, never mov'd against, or censur'd, and condemn'd the *old Version*.

Besides, *Time* and *Customs* has hallowed and consecrated the Use of the *old Psalms*, and entitle 'em to a sort of *Prescription*.

But why should the *Vindicator* think that the *new Version* is more *subservient to the Advancement of Piety and Devotion* than the *old*? Is it because it has occasion'd such *Disturbance* and *Confusion* in those *few Congregations* where it has been receiv'd and us'd: Insomuch that the *Church-wardens* of St. *Catherine Creed-Church*, *London*, (where Mr. *Brady* himself was lately *Minister*) observing what a *great Confusion* the singing of the *new Psalms* occasion'd in that Church, (where, it seems, by Mr. *Brady*'s Influence they were receiv'd and us'd) made an Order of *Vestry* for the laying of 'em aside, and that the *old Psalms* should be us'd again.

But though the *new Version* is not *subservient to the Advancement of Piety and Devotion*, yet it may to the *Advancement of Money*, *and the Getting of an Estate*; which perhaps the *Undertakers* had in view, and a promising Prospect of upon this *Performance*.

But let 'em wait with Patience until a *Convocation* shall think fit to silence the *old Version*, and approve of, recommend, and enjoin

join the Uſe of the *new one*, and then they may have their End. And I am perſwaded, That the whole *Body* of the *Clergy* (whom now the *Vindicator* is ſo angry with, for not complying with the *proud, impoſing Humour*) will pay as ready a Compliance and Obedience, as the moſt *zealous Promoters* and *Abettors* of the *preſent Undertaking*.

In the mean time, let the *Performance* be never ſo *excellent* and *laudable*, to attempt to impoſe it on the *Clergy* and *People*, in ſuch Inſtances as the *modeſt Vindication* does, is unaccountable *Rudeneſs* and *Preſumption*, which the *Vindicator*, or his *Authors*, ought to retract, and beg pardon for.

THE END.